Preserve

App. F. IX-4

193?
(Miscellaneous)

File No. 267
Serial Nos. 1 - 16

Previous References

Misc 6: 27 1 10
" 21 20 1 2

Later References.

Misc 212-34-1-4
Misc 7-38-1-2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 16

Part B for February 1935

SUBJECT.

Re. recalling the Brahmins
employed etc. in Sivaganga Swamy
Temple at Kodiyur Kunnakudi Taluk

The Misc Counter
sent to Trichy

WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34

1. 13. S. of 6-2-35.

Sanctioning the removal of Brahmin pariyaris
on payment of a compensation of Rs 200/-
appointment of a high class

PR 1931
822

1931.

DEW S MINUTE.

1 APR. 1931
DEW OFFICE

FILE No. 193

31. MAR. 1931

I. Secy Mis 267-32-1

(1) I hear the Shastrigal Parpatagar of Yedeyoor Temple is still there. Might it not be decided to send him away.

31-3-31

(2) Mis. Pl. up. & h as ans

1.4.31

DKB

(3) Subs Writes the Connected file. Kind ref. is invited to the orders in Secon dy 29.8.29. at para 88 of Mis P 362-27. The order communicated on 16.9.29 to M.C. has been confirmed in the Corrections Mis 296-29-112 & Mis 31-30-112.

Fl. Secy)

1.4.31

Please speak.

1.4.31

Secon Mem
Ch. Member)

2.4.31

DE 5549/31

(5) Pls you Hons ascertain from the M.C. how the arrangt refd to in yr D.O. of 16/9/29 has worked so far.

2/4

(Mis 4/4)

Muz File No. 267 of 193 0 - 1

Serial No.



10 Dfts sd
Gs Cb 11 For kind perusal before issue.
2/4
First Member) VS 4.4.31

12) DM 4.4.31

13) Issue VS 4.4.31

2 No 2187 of 6/4/1931 to the Muzrai Commissioner calling for the submission of a report on the encroachment referred in letter no C 53 [illegible]

[illegible]

3 Letter no C 1612/30-31 of 16.6.31 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding copy of letter no M 2280 dt. 16/5/31 from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar stating that is found difficult to find suitable men for the post of non-Brahmin Parsi pathegar for the temple at Jedigyan village.

In the circumstances reported the receipt of a further communication will be awaited if any.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

The present report may now be submitted after the minutes in para 8.

H. Secy) 20.6.31

16) 1st Member Dewan) 20/6/31

17)

DEWAN OFFICE 7124 23. JUN. 1931

18) 23-6-31

Letter No. 1612/30-31 Dated 9.7-31. from the Mag Conner reporting on the appointment of an Assistant Pariahpathegan for the temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Tk

19) The Deputy Commissioner has appointed [illegible]

20)

Sub (15-9-31)

21) Yes 13.7.31

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. — of 193 0.

Serial No.	
5	Letter No 612/30-31 & 4.12.1931 from the Madras Commissioners forwarding copy of Deputy Commissioner's letter No M 2684/30-31 & 26.11.1931 in the matter of the scheme of appointing an Assistant Pandaram to the Vedapuram Sri Subramaniaswami temple Kumbakonam Taluk and stating that particulars account has been borrowed to enable the Sabe custody of the jewels and the satisfactory conduct of Seva in the temple 2) The question of the relation of trade between the Pandaram and the Asst Pandaram is as described in copy of the D.C's letter of 26/11/31 3) The receipt of a further report which will be awaited by the end of June next. The records will be returned after perusal (Sd H. Secy) 4) 16.12.31 5) 1st Memo) 21-12

4807/16/12

NOTE—Contin Sheet

File No. of 193 | General and Reve Secretariat

D/s returning the records to M.C. to Muttra

GL MSV

27) The file may perhaps be sent to the Dewan also for perusal of the report of the Muzrai Com^r D/4 12 31

DEWAN'S 8 JAN 1932

5261/7/1

Secy) 6/1

Dewan) 7/1/32

MD 10-1-32

TYPING SECTN 12 JAN 1932

(May the draft-in file issue?

1/1/32

Yes 12/1

No 956 M 13.1.32 to the Muzrai Commissioner returning the file & papers received therein with sanction for the Rs 12-4-0 Letter No C 1612/30-31 D 6/4/32 from the Muzrai Commissioner stating that a sum of Rs 200/- be given to the Brahmin Pandaram of Kodalangeswara Swami temple Kunnil Palace as a sort of compensation for the loss of appointment under the circumstances set forth and he be allowed a pension of Rs 3/- per mensem

TYPING SECTION 19 JAN 19 ENT

Serial No.

from the temple funds and requesting Sanction to abolish the Assistant Parpatteggar post and to the appointment of a Dinjayer Parpatteggar on a salary of Rs 12/- p.m.

The scheme ordered in 653/ Misc 362-27-9 of 1679/29 is reported to have not worked satisfactorily & the proposals of the M.C. are for orders

GS
7/5

For reasons explained by the M.C. his recommendation to remove the Brahmin Parpatteggar paying him a compensation of Rs 200/- and a pension of Rs 3, p.m. from the temple funds and the appointment of a Dinjayer Parpatteggar on Rs 12/- p.m., the Asst Parpatteggar appointment being abolished may be sanctioned.

8/5/33

(Hosey)
2nd Mr

10/5

10/5

Is the present Parpatteggar agreeable to this arrangement or is it intended to compulsorily retire him

7/5

29/5

29/5

Second M... ...ber of ... I...
10 MAY
No. 7.4.6.4

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31

The documents in this
is regarding Sri
Kunigal Taluk.

Mmg File No. 267 of 1932

I Opn submd

Sec
6/6

D/S

No 1758 of 9.6.33 to the Mysore Commissioner calling for additional information

Letter No 1612/30-31 & 7-8-1933 from the Mysore Commissioner furnishing information called for from him.

The Panchayatdar has agreed to relinquish his place on payment of a Compensation of Rs 2000/- & a monthly pension of Rs 3/-

The information furnished is fully covered by remarks in para 36 supra & orders solicited on the proposals of the M.C. of 6/4/33

H.Secy) Noted
15/8/33
Refer para 36

The M.C.'s recommendations may be sd

2nd Member) 16.8.33

16/8

Please bring up

(The present proposal is practically the same as the one which was not accepted in 1929)

22/8

TYPING
6. JUN.
GENL. & RE

Second Member of Court
16 AUG
No. 798

No 653
Mmg 362 27-9
dy 16/9/29.

Serial No.

No 653/Muz3
362-27-9
dt 16.9.1929.

Submitted

minuted by the member, the proposal is the same as the one that was turned down in 1929 with this difference, that the Brahmin Parpatteyan has agreed to accept Compensation and take pension to vacate Office. But then the point urged then is still operative, viz that in the administration of temples, it will be inconvenient to accept the principle of appointing an administrative person a member of the persuasion to which the temple is to conform. With them the grant of compensation and pension in the case of the Parpatteyan who is proposed to be displaced may be accepted, it has to be made clear that the filling up of the place has to be guided purely by the consideration of the person most competent to discharge the duties entrusted to him irrespective of the denomination to which he may belong and not necessarily of the same persuasion as the temple. Kind reference is invited to Devasm minute dated 29.8.29 in File no 362-27 of 1929.

29.8.33

2d Member

29/8

Second Member of Council
1 SEP.
No. 7 2 3

I discussed the question raised in this file with the present Muzrai Commissioner, Mr. N. Madhava Rao.

The Muzrai Commissioner (Mr. S. Hiriannaiya) states that, though no specific irregularity can be brought home to the Peshkar, he may be retired on a

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31

Parpa for Jamindar

Mut File No. 267

DEWAN'S OFFICE 3073 of 1932 11 NOV 1933

liberal compensation of Rs.200 ~~lumpsum and Rs 3~~ of Rs 3 per month pension. I do not think it is quite fair to the temple to be saddled with this additional and permanent expenditure, especially when no fault is found with the man. It is in view of this difficulty that Government ordered, as a compromise, the appointment of an additional Lingayet Parpathegar. It was actually given effect to from July 1931 and I think it may be tried for some time longer before it is given up. The Huzrai Commissioner may, therefore, be asked to continue this arrangement for some-time longer and send up a further report about a year hence.

DEWAN'S OFFICE 3482 1933

Tumkur Dt. G.O. 5/26 II 3.

9/11

9/10/11

Refer Dewan's minute dt 6.10.33

In perusal

Dewan) 4/11/33 1/10/11/33

Does the Lingayet Parpathegar get any remuneration

11-11-33

8/28/11

The present Lingayet (Assistant) Parpathegar is getting a pay of Rs. 4/- per mensem

17/11/33 Dewan)

Noted

17/11/33

Y.h discussed with Comm'r

28-11-33

27/11.

8/28/11

Chief)

8/29/11/33

5-photos taken who died inspection

25/11/33

Chief

R&I

DEWAN'S MINUTE

FILE No. 193

Muzrai Secretary.

The Iyengar Parpathigar of Yediyur Temple, Kunigal Taluk.

There was an idea of transferring him from that temple. Is the present arrangement working well?

6.10.'33.

XX A/s Muz
Perhaps refer above
with file
6.10.33
7/10/33

Subtd. (Diary No. 165)
The Connected files
before the 2nd Member
of Council having
subtd on 31/8/1933
7/10/33

H Secy)

7/10/33

2d Member)
11.10.33
11/10

(For Disposal at a Meeting)

No. C. 160
of 1933-4

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Council Matter.

SUBJECT

(clause..... .... of the schedule)

Question of retiring the Brahmin Parpathegar in Sri Siddalingesvaraswami temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

CIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

By Order,

R. Rangaiah
Chief Secretary to Government.

3rd December 1933.

4377
7/XII/33 **First Member of Council.**

8/12/33

3386
7/12 **Second Member of Council.**

7/12

8/12

Subject:-

52 Proposal to retire the Brahmin Parpathegar of Siddalingeswaraswami temple at Yediyur in Kunigal Taluk.

OPINION OF THE COUNCIL.

R.C. for Collector
further inquiries for mazr.
53) RB
(4/12/33).

Financial Secy. with Comps)
(Mazrai)

RB
16/12/33 -
1/

Order
Draft for
authority
View of fact that the
Such appts shd not be
regarded as to confer
hereditary or permanent
and do not terminate
of Govt no compensation
and be payable
when this individual
as dies
sufficient time for the
Temple to work his
satisfactorily discharge
it may be as reported
by
16/12
16/12

Re: The Brahmin Pampathegar to Yediyur Sri Siddalingeswara Swami temple

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 67 of 1932. — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

Draft Rbkt. as directed.

H-Leg) 19/12/33

2nd Asst) 19/12

Sd Jon, 21/12

Sd 21/12

10 No. 887 of 2.1.34 to the Muzrai Commissioner calling for further information

Letter no 1612/30-31 of 15.6.1934 from the Muzrai Commissioner stating that the Brahmin Pampathegar of the Yediyur temple may be removed from office for reasons given by the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District

Letter no 1612 of 27.6.1934 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding a petition from the Pampathegar of Yediyur temple and the application from some of the Dharmadarsis regarding the retention of the Pampathegar and stating that he does not, in view of his old age, deserve any gratuity as originally recommended.

The question regarding the work of the Pampathegar is connected with the question regarding the [illegible] 30/31 of 1.4. [illegible] the Superior Courts Commissioner

NOTE—Contn Sheet

Second Member's Room
O & C
No. 3.6.34

TYPING SECT
[illegible]
LEGL. & REV. SEC.

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-32

Re the work of Brahmins in Ayodhya temple

1356
1381

File No.	of 193	General and Re Secretariat

Serial No.

The Brahmin Pandits of the Ayodhya temple (Encl. P.D.I.) state that the Panchayat Deeds included a case in 3 suits in a place which is already being objected with this exhibit. Thus many of misfeasance on his objecting a Shambhoge, Chairman of the village Panchayat he does not devote undisturbed attention to his duties in the temple. These charges are refuted in P.D.I. rec'd on 9.6.1934 from the Panchayat & also a representation signed by some Brahmins of the temple.

12 The recommendation of the A.C. to remove the Brahmin is worth keeping in any ensuing mode whether the Superintendent is discharging his duties satisfactorily & the correspondence ends by 24.3.32 - 10 By 2/1/34.

13 Action for orders

14 29/6 The report of the Asst Collector of the 3rd circle the present recommendation of the D.C. is based have not been sent alongwith the records

29/6/34

15 Orders with respect to recommendation para 55 Supra - 29/6

2nd dear

16 M 7/7 2/7/17

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL. 7 JULY 1934 NO 166

C-B. 38/

1

1/5



Council instructions.

67 The papers regarding the Parpathegar of Yediyur may be put up for Subs to 2nd member

RLR
6/9/34

Asst. Secy.)
Muzrai Branch)

68 The file was submitted to the II Member on 7.7.34 and orders are awaited.

6/9/34

+ P.L. W/P



Ch: Secy) Subs 69 RLR
7/9/34
2nd member
7/9

70 I wanted to discuss the matter with the Dewan The Dewan's note of the 22nd Oct disposes of the matter + action may be taken accdly If the man is to be removed + unemployed, some sort of compensation has to be given perhaps 26/10

26/10/34

Letter No. 647 dt 30.10.1934 from Muzrai to Sheristadar (Vailaya) issued as per orders on file on subject viz. Muzr 86-34.

Mcy 86-34-1.

Office of the Dewan of Mysore,

NOTE.

Camp Mysore, *Dated*.....22nd October.....1934.

Mcy 247-32-13

22 OCT. 1934
M·596

Chief Secretary.

GENL. SECRETARIAT 479. 26 OCT 1934 MYSORE

71 I visited the temple at Yediyur village in Kunigal Taluk on the 26th ultimo. I understand that the temple has a fairly large amount at its credit. I have suggested that the approach road to the temple should be improved and a few fruit trees planted on either side of it, the expenditure being debited to the temple funds.

RR 23/10/34

71 The Dharmadarsis of the temple made some representations to me concerning the Parpathegar. There are two questions for consideration - one about the Puja and the other relating to the management of the temple. In the former case, I think it is but right that the Lingayets should continue to conduct the Puja. But the management of the temple is an administrative matter. If, as seemed from the local feeling, the present Parpathegar is unpopular, he may be replaced by a more desirable man but his successor need not necessarily be a Lingayet, considering that the Hindus of all communities are devotees of the temple. The Muzrai Commissioner may be requested to kindly go into the matter.

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL. 24 OCT. 1934 No. 307

73 For perusal before further action

RR

74 23/10/34 I agree. The subject is one of the subjects allocated to me. I also endorse the note of the question

DEWAN. 25/10/34

75 24/10/34 DEWAN. 26/10/34

Serial No.

+3
14 To the Municipal Commissioner
Letter No 647 dated 30.10.34
Communicates to him the orders
para 72 of the Notes suppressing the request
him to enquire into the matter and submit
a report on the lines of instructions
by Government.

14 Letter No 1512/30 dated 2.11.34.
15 From the Municipal Commissioner
Madras forwarding in reference to his
letter for the abolishing the Brahmin
Sanitary Inspectorship and the
Corporation's decision in the matter
Hindu in his place, and requesting
sanction

M. 15/

Points for orders.

A (i) Removal of the present Brahmin
sanitary inspector, on payment of a Compensation
of Rs 200 for loss of appointment; and
(ii) Appointing a high class Hindu in the
former's place, on a pay of Rs 12 per
Reference: paras 72-74 Supra

Ex 25/1/35

7. The two proposals of the
D.C. as at A agreed to by the
Ex-mayor may be approved

Ch: Engr) 1/RR 26/1/35
26/1

2nd member 28/1/35

2nd 29/1/35 KRK 29.1.35 28/1/35

Note–Contn Sheet.

GENERAL SECTT
26 JAN

File No. 267 of 193 2

General and Revenue Secretariat

A draft G.O is pendg.

DOS 22/1

Ch: Secy)

82) For permanent appointment. 31/1/36

83) RR 1/2/35

Down.

2/2/35

MS

2-2-35.

RR 4-2

2/2/42

D... OFFICE
2 FEB. 1935
No. 4331

6th April 1931.

267-32-2

Financial xx

The Muzrai Commissioner,
Bangalore.

I am directed to invite reference to this office letter No.653/Muz.362-27-9 dated 16th September 1929 in the matter of the continuance of the services of the old Parupathegar of the Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk and of ~~the~~ appointment of an Assistant Parupathegar of the Lingayet community in addition for wo in the institution, and to request you to be so good as to report at once as to how the arrangement ordered therein has worked so far.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

V Subrahmanya Sastri

for Secretary to Government,
S-S Financial Department.

Appendix F G—1

UBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mug

File No. 267 - 32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 2137

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

To

4-C

Date of issue 6. 4. 31

Sir,

I am directed to invite
this office
reference letter No 6 S 3/Mug
362-24-9 of 16. 9. 29
in the matter of the continuance
of the Services of a
Probationer of the Sri
Siddalinga Swamis
Institute at Yedeyur Kunigal
Tk and the appointment of
a Lingayat
of the Lingayat Community
for work in the Institution
as aforesaid, and to request
you will be so good as

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

[over

WD 02559—GPB—25,000—25 6-30

Fabiani report at once
how the arrangement ordered
therein has worked so far.

I have etc

4.4.31

for Secretary

H dept

9.5
4/4 CB

/30-31
el one.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

REV. SECTARIAT
18 JUN 1931
1677

Bangalore, 13th June 1931

Muz 6(1)67 32 3

FROM

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

16 JUNE 1931

To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.2187 dated 6th April 1931 calling for a report on the working of the arrangement of having an assistant parupathegar also at the Yedeyur temple, as ordered in -- Government Order No.653/Muz.632-27-9 dated 16th September 1930, I have the honor to forward for your information, copy of letter ---- No.I.2380/30-31 dated 16th May 1931 from the Dep'ty Commissioner --- Tumkur, explaining what has been done so far in the matter. In --- pursuance of the above Government Order one Siddalingiah was appointed as Assistant Parupathegar and his pay and duties were duly fixed. But as it was learnt that this Siddaliah had been convicted in a criminal court, another person by name Thimmaraja was appointed on 30th October 1930. It seems that this Yajmana has been excommunicated from the Lingayat Community and hence is said to have been unable to attend to the 'Balehonnur Patt' for ascertaining the real facts. The village of Yedeyur is a small one and it is said to be very difficult to find --- therein suitable person for this place. The Deputy Commissioner states that he has called for a further report from the Amildar and would take necessary action on its receipt.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

SPRajagopal

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.M.2230/30-31 dated 16th May 1931 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Huzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to your Memo No.1612/30-31 dated 16th April 1931 calling for a report on the working of the arrangement of having a parapathegar and an assistant parpathegar for the Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk, I have the honor to state that in pursuance of Government Order No. 53 [illegible] 27-9 dated 16-9-1929 one Siddalingaih of the Lingayet community was appointed assistant parpathegar to the temple and that his pay was ordered to be fixed at (Rs.4/-) about half of that of the parpathegar. It was further ordered that the assistant parpathegar should be entrusted with the duties of the parpathegar inside the temple -- connected with the worship and ceremonies, the other work being done by the parpathegar as before and the facts are also reported to you (vide this office letter No.706/3 -31 dated 15-10-1930.). The Amildar having subsequently reported that this Siddalingaih was convicted in a criminal court in a case connected with the Postal Department, one Mr. Yediyurappa was appointed to the ---- Assistant Parpathegar's place 31-10-30. The Amildar from whom a report as regards the working of the arrangement of having two -- parpathegars to the temple, was called for, says that one Siddiah and other archiks of the temple did not agree to the appointment of Mr. Yediyurappa as assistant parpathegar in view of the fact that Mr. Yediyurappa is a man excommunicated from their caste, that a reference has therefore been made to "Balehonnur Matt" for ---- ascertaining the real facts and that it has been very difficult to find out a suitable person to the place as the village is a small one where there are only a few lingayet houses most of them belonging to the Archiks and their relatives. No further progress to be submitted proposals in this behalf will be made. I have asked the Amildar to expedite his report in the matter and shall take needful action as soon as his report is received in this office.

2. The Amildar's report (in original) is herein returned for kind reference.

"Copy"

Veerasangappa

For Huzrai Commissioner.

RNM

2/330-31
2.

D7200 28-31.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 7th July *1931*

9

Mcy 267-32-4

FROM

C. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.





To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,



Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

In continuation of this office letter No.C.1612/30-31 dated 16th June 1931 regarding the appointment of an Assistant Parupathegar for the temple at Yediyur, Kunigal taluk, I have the honor to state that the Deputy Commissioner has since reported that besides the question of excommunication pending with the Balehonnur Mutt, it is learnt that Yediyurappa and the temple archaks are not on good terms and that the former's appointment would lead to trouble in the management of temple affairs. As no suitable person is to be found either at Yediyur or in the neighboring villages, the local officers have selected one Gangadhara of Kunigal who is agreeable to work as an Assistant Parupathegar.

The Deputy Commissioner has accordingly appointed him to the post and has stated that he would submit a report as to his work at the end of a month after his taking charge.

Copy of Deputy Commissioner's letter No.2634/30-31 dated 29th June 1931 is forwarded herewith for information.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

S/d
1st Member
Dewan
9-7-31

10.7.31

11-7-31

Letter No.M.26 Dated 29th June 1931 from the Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Dy Orc.

In continuation of my letter No.2280/30-31 dated 16th July 1931, re: the posting of one Yediyurappa, as assistant Parupathegar to the temple of Sri Siddalingeswaraswamy at Yediyur in the Kunigal Taluk, I have the honor to state that as certain objections were received against his appointment consequent on his having been excommunicated, a reference was made to the "Bale Honnur Mutt" for ascertaining the real facts. The reply received from the Mutt goes to show that the excommunication was in respect of certain religious matters against the son of Yediyurappa and that the matter has not been finally decided. It is further reported by the Amildar that Yediyurappa and the temple archik are not on good terms and that the appointment of Yediyurappa would lead to trouble in the management of the temple affairs. Consequently another person has been selected by the Amildar.

As there was not a suitable person to be found either in Yediyur or its neighbouring villages, the Amildar has selected one Mr. Gargappa of Kunigal, who is agreeable to work as Assistant Parupathegar. The Sub Division Officer also recommends his appointment.

I have therefore appointed Gangappa as Assistant Parupathegar and I have issued instructions to report as to his work after one month. On receipt of the Amildar's report I shall intimate the result to you in due course.

"C o p y"

Yenanasegga Rao

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Ms. C: 13]

No. 1612/30-31
Enl File

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT
607
7 - DEC 1931
MYSORE

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, 2nd December 1931.

Mzg 267-32-5

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ,. M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.
Finance *Department.*

SIR,

In continuation of this office letter No. M.1612/30-31 -- dated 9th July 1931 regarding the posting of a trained assistant Sarathegar to the Taluk Sirsi Sheristadar's office -- temporarily, Kunigal Taluk, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's letter No. M.3091/30-31 dated 26th November 1931, stating that the Sarathegar of Kunigal taluk was posted as Assistant Sarathegar on 15-7-31 and setting forth in detail the duties that have been assigned to the said Assistant Sarathegar from time to time. The question of the particular attention to be paid to the work of the Sarathegars and the various duties to be assigned to the Sarathegars from time to time, is a matter which requires some examination and discussion before any definite orders in the matter could be issued. It is hoped that this will be done after a period of one month.

The enclosed file is returned herewith.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Letter No.I .2684/30-31 dated 26th November 1931 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject:- Working of the scheme of appointing an Assistant Parupathegar to the temple of Sri Siddalingeswara Swamy at Vediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

In continuation of this office No.I .2684/30-31 dated 8th October 1931 re the above subject, I have the honor to state as follows:-

Mr. Gangappa of Kunigal is reported to have entered upon his -- duties as Assistant Parupathegar on 15-7-1931 and it is stated that -- the following duties have been entrusted to him in the said temple.

a. To help the devotees in their performance of sevas.

b. To receive the కట్టుకాణిక్కె and to deliver them to the Parupathegar after entry in the prescribed registers.

c. To take care of the jewels given out for daily use and to be present at the time of changing the terms of the archaks.

d. And to be in charge of all the ornaments on festival days for purposes of procession and to deliver them back at the close of the function.

2. The parupathegar is said to have been entrusted with the --- following duties:-

a. To maintain the attendance register and to keep regular account of income and expenditure.

b. To supervise the punctual performance of pujas every day, etc. and to see that the subordinates do their duties properly.

c. To get ready all the వాహనములు on festival days and disburse the pay of the temple servants.

d. And to receive the కట్టుకాణిక్కె from the Assistant Parupathegar and to keep them safe after entering them in the stock register.

3. The Sub Division Officer, Gubbi, who has, in company with the Amildar, the Parupathegar, the Assistant Parupathegar and some of the Dharmadarsis and villagers, inspected the temple on 13-10-1931 states that the work distribution is satisfactory, but that it requires some six months' time for him to furnish any definite opinion on the working of this new arrangement since the Assistant Parupathegar was appointed only recently.

4. The entire file on the subject er in with the Gubbi Sub ----- Division Officer's No.Gl.5196/31-32 dated 11th November 1931 is herewith ~~with~~ enclosed for kind perusal and return.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Rev

File No. 267-32

Serial No. 6.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No 956 Income Tax

To

Mr. A. C.

Sir,

I am directed to return herewith the file of papers received with your letter No 1612/30-31 dated 4/12/31 in the matter of the working of the Scheme of assessing the Assessees of the Tiruvannamalai Sri Sambandhar Swami Temple Committee, Tiruvannamalai, and to request that the decision of the Government may be communicated before the end of June next.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Secretary to Government.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 13/1/32

Signed by Mr A Subbaraya

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 71—GPBM—40,000—20-7-31

M C. 13]

No. C 16 12/30-31
Income file



OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, 3rd April 1933.

Muz 267-32-7

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ,. M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



6/4

To

S. Shamanna, Esquire., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.
Financial ...*Department.*

SIR,

Adverting to your letter No.956/Muz. dated 13th January --- 1932 calling for a report in the matter of the working of the ---- scheme of appointing an Assistant Parupathegar to the Yediyur Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple, Kunigal Taluk, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of letter No.2684/30-31 dated 11th February 1933 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District stating that the present arrangement of having a Brahmin Parpathegar and a Lingayet assistant Parpathegar has not worked satisfactorily, that there has been much local agitation against the continuance of the Brahmin -- Parpathegar from a long time, and that the appointment of a ------ Lingayat Assistant Parpathegar has not solved the difficulty. Agreeing with the Dharmadarsis and the Sub Division Officer the -- Deputy Commissioner recommends that the present posts of both the Parpathegar and assistant Parpathegar may be abolished and sanction may be accorded to the appointment of salaried Parpathegar on ---- Rs.12/- p.m. in which case the services of a suitable person who would reside in the village permanently to look after the work of the institution will be secured.

2. Although, no specific charges can be levilled against the Parpathegar, it is not desirable to force him on an unwilling ---- community. Though strictly speaking, the decision of Government communicated in their letters No.653/Muz.31-30-5 dated 632-27-9 ~~16-7-30~~ 14-9-29 ~~is~~ and 730/Muz.31-30-2 dated 16-7-30 is correct

correct and there is no valid reason to reconsider it, in -- view of the strong objection of the Lingayat community or of a not negligible portion of it, to the appointment of a Brahmin Parpathegar, it seems desirable to remove the ---- present incumbent. But before he is so removed he has to be given an adequate compensation for the loss of appointment. In view of the his long service in the temple and the fact that no specific irregularities are brought home to him, I would recommend that a sum of Rs.200/- may be paid to him as compensation and that he may also be given a pension of Rs.3/-p.m. from the temple funds.

2) I request that sanction of Government may be accorded to abolish the Assistant Parpathegar's post and to the appointment of a Lingayat ~~et~~ Parpathegar on a salary of Rs.12/- p.m. and the payment of a compensation of Rs.200/- and a pension of Rs.3/--- per mensem to the retiring Brahmin Parpathegar.

The records are submitted herewith for favour of reference.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.3684/30-31 dated 11th February 1933 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Wirking of the scheme of appointing an Assistant Parpathegar to the Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

In continuation of this office letter No.3684/30-31 dated 28-11-1931 and with reference to your Memo No.1012/30-31 dated 21st January 1932 regarding the above mentioned subject, I have the honour to state that the Dharmadarsis of the temple in question have passed a resolution on 21-10-32 to the effect that the quantity of work of the temple is not much as to require the services of two parpathegars, that a suitable single person who can do the external as well as the internal duties of the temple may be appointed on a suitable salary in lieu of the present two incumbents. The senior parpathegar happens to be a brammin whose removal from Office has been urged from time to time but Government have finally decided in their letter No.653 Muz.632-27-9 dated 14/16-9-1929 that it should be unfair to remove the -- present parpathegar.

The Amildar who was directed to report on the work of the Assistant Parpathegar whose appointment and puja duties were reported in this office letter dated 23-11-1931 reports that the Dharmadarsis themselves are not in favour of the continuance of the present incumbent in view of the fact that he is residing at Kunigal and is not in a position to discharge his functions satisfactorily. The Sub Division Officer has inspected the institution in the month of October 1932., and while concurring with the Amildar in his opinion regarding the unsatisfactory nature of the work of the present -- Assistant Parpathegar further states that as a suitable candidate cannot be found in Yediyur and adjoining villages the post of the Assistant Parpathegar may be abolished. He further states that the present parpathegar is a man of diverse functions being at the same time Shanbhogue of a firka consisting of seven villages and the chairman of the village panchayet. He states further that his work in each of the several offices he holds is reported to be unsatisfactory.

Under the circumstances the Sub Division Officer reports that it may be quite possible to secure the services of a suitable person on Rs.12/- per month who would reside in the village permanently to look after the affairs of the institution.

I agree with the Sub Division Officer and request that the present posts of both Parpathegar and Assistant Parpathegar may be abolished and sanction may be accorded to the appointment of a salaried parpathegar on

Rs.12/- per mensem. It may be mentioned here that this present arrangement of a brahmin parpathegar and a Lingayet Assistant Parpathegar has not worked satisfactorily all these years. There has been much local agitation against the Parpathegar from a long time and the appointment of a lingayet Assistant Parpathegar has not solved the difficulty. The entire file of vernacular correspondence ending with Gubbi Sub Division Officer's report No.Al.625/31-32 dated 2-11-32 accompanies for kind reference and return.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT,

No. 1758 Revenue file — *Dated, Bangalore,* 7th June 193 3.

Mwz 267-32-8

From

The *Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Wuzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With refere to the correspondence ending with your letter No.C.1612/32-31 dated 6th April 1933, recommending the removal of the Brahmin Parupathegar in Vediyur Sri Siddalingeswaraswami Temple - Nuniga1 Taluk on payment of a compensation of Rs.200/- and the grant of a pension of Rs.3/- per mensem to him, I am directed to request you to be so good as to state whether the present Parupathegar is agreeable to the above arrangement or whether it is intended to compulsorily retire him.

The connected records are herewith returned for reference and retransmission with your reply.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Financial Secretary to Government.

K.M.F.2/7-6.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to ....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 9/6/33

Signed by W B Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section Mem 3

File No. 267-32

Serial No. 8

No. 1758 Same file

To

The M-C

Sir,

(The Correspondence ending with
this reply began with letter
No C 1612/30-31 dt 6/4/33
recommending the removal
of the Brahmin Pampathegar
in Yedeyur Sri Siddalingeswara
Swami Temple - Kunigal Tk
on payment of a Compensation
of Rs 200/- instead of the grant
a pension of Rs 3/- to him
I am directed to request you
to be so good as to state
whether the present Pampathegar
is agreeable to the above arrangement
~~proposed in the~~

~~advertence so far as there is Concerned~~;
or whether it is intended to compulsorily
retire him - ~~It refers to the case~~
~~does reported~~ - The Records
~~receives with further details~~
are here with returned for reference
& necessary action with your report.

Thanks Etc

L 6/6

for AI SCE

GS DC
1/6
5

D. 1612 Rev I file
D-31

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
9 AUG 1933
No.

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 7th August 1933

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

REV. ECC
165
11 AUG. 1933
MUZRAI

To

A. N. Raghavachar, Esq., M.A.,
Offg. *Secretary to the Government of His Highness*
the Maharaja of Mysore,
F i n a n c i a l ...*Department.*

Mg 267-32-9

SIR,

Adverting to your letter No.1758/Muz.267-32-8 dated 7/9-6-33 re: the removal of the Brahmin Parupathegar in Yediyur Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple, Kunigal Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of letter No.M.2684/30-31 dated 25-7-33 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, stating that the present Parupathegar is agreeable to retire on payment of a compensation of R. 200/- and a pension of Rs 3/- per mensem. His statement dated 14-7-33 before the Sub Division Officer, Gubbi Sub Division, is enclosed in the file. I request therefore that orders on my recommendation may be passed early.

2. The Deputy Commissioner recommends that the Assistant Parupathegar may be abolished and that a the Lingayet community with necessary qualifications may be ordered to be appointed on a pay of R. 12/- a month. On receipt of orders sanctioning the retirement of the Prahmin Parupathegar the question of the appointment of a full time Lingayet Parupatnegar will be taken up by me.

3. The records are submitted herewith for favour of reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Asst Comr
for Muzrai Commissioner.
(absent on casual leave)

ter No.M.2684/30-31 dated 25-7-33 from the Deputy Commiss ner, Tumkur ct, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject:- Removal of the Parupathegar of the temple of Sri Siddalingeswaraswam at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

With reference to your letter No.1012/30-31 dated 23-6-1933 calling for the submission of a report as regards the present parupathegar's opinion in the matter of his relinquising his right to the parupatnegar's post on payment of a compensation of R. 200/- and monthly pension of R. 3/- from the said temple funds, I have the honor to state that he is agreeable to the proposal and has also given his statement to that effect before the Gubbi Sub Division Officer on 14-7-1933. The post of the Assistant Parupatnegar may be abolished as recommended by the Sub Division Officer. A person of the Lingayet community with necessary qualifications may be ordered to be appointed on a pay of R. 12/ month. The connected records are enclosed.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner
in Mysore, Bangalore.

25/11.

Dear Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer,

I have looked into the connected papers. The pay of the Lingayat Parapatiss is only Rs 4/- p.m., as mentioned by you. The Brahmin Parpatteyas get Rs 8/- p.m.

Yours sincerely,
A Venkatasubba

I have the honour to b

ON MYSORE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

To,

H. N. Krishnaswami Iyer, Esq
B.A.,
Retd. Cr. R.S.

GOVERNMENT HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 887 Dated, Bangalore, 26th Dec. 1933

Mez 267-32-10 2nd Jany 1934

From

The *Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No.1612/30-31 dated 7th August 1933 the matter of the removal of the Brahmin Parpathegar in Yediyur Sri Siddalingesvaraswami temple, Kunigal Taluk, I am directed to state that Government consider that such appointments should not ordinarily be regarded as either hereditary or pensionable and that in this view no compensation would be payable for the termination of his services.

In this connection, I am to enquire whether the individual in question is devoting sufficient time for the temple work and whether he is satisfactorily discharging it.

The favour of a very early report is requested.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

7 Jan 34

For Financial Secretary to Government.

45

mk.2

Appendix F.G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mem

File No. 2547-32

Serial No. 10

No. 889 Enclosure

To

The ME

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 2-1-34.

Mr K.N. Krishnaswami Ayr

Signed by .....

List of enclosures .....

Ordinary

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Sir,

With reference to the Correspondence ending with your letter No. 1612/30-31 of 7.8.1933 ~~reg~~ in the matter of the removal of the Brahmin Parpathegar in Yediyur Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple, Kunigal Tk., I am directed to state that Govt. consider that such appointments should not be regarded as either hereditary or pensionable & that, in this view, no compensation would be payable for the termination of his services

In this Connection, I am to enquire whether the individual in question is devoting sufficient time for the temple work & whether he is satisfactorily discharging it.

The favour of a very early reply is requested.

I have &c

Secretary

Received 19/12/33 PL-Leg

Bangalore, ... 1934

15
43





MADHAVA RAU, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Mes 267-32-11

C. Shamanna, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government,
[illegible]

9/
18/6

Re...v l of ... [illegible]
[illegible]

...th reference to ... [illegible] ...
...67, dts. 307-33-10 dated 3-1-34 ... [illegible] ...
... to forward ... [illegible] ... 34, and
3-1-34 ... [illegible] ... , ... [illegible] ...
... I agree with ... [illegible] ...
... expressed by ... [illegible] ...
...ved ... [illegible] ...

... file of ... [illegible] ...

... [illegible] ...
... [illegible] ...
... [illegible] ...

G. Rudrappa

erence to your Memo No.1612/30-31 dated [illegible]

whether the present parpatheyar of the Sri [illegible] ediyur, Kunigal Taluk, is devoting [illegible] whether his work is satisfactory, I have the honor to [illegible] Kunigal Taluk, has reported that the [illegible] villages and is also the Chairman of the Village [illegible] cannot devote undisturbed attention to his duties as [illegible] further stated that the [illegible] [illegible] opinion that it is desirable that [illegible] Sri Basavaiah, Amildar, Gubbi, also supports [illegible] to his meritorious services.

Under the above circumstances, I submit [illegible]

"J O B"

G. Rudrappa

Letter No.887/Muz.267-32-10 dated 2-1-34 from the Fin. Secy. to the Govt., of Mysore, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

-

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No.1612/30-31 dated 7-8-33 in the matter of the removal of the Brahmin Parupathegar in Yediyur Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple, Kunigal Taluk, I am directed to state that Govt., consider that such appointments should not ordinarily be regarded as either hereditary or pensionable and that in this view no compensation would be payable for the termination of his services.

In this connection I am to enquire whether the individual in question is devoting sufficient time for the temple work and whether he is satisfactorily discharging it.

The favour of a very early report is requested.

-

No.1612/30-31 MEMO Dated 10-1-34.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, with reference to correspondence ending with his letter No.M.2684/30-31 dated 25-7-33 for information.

Further report may be submitted as called for in the second para of the Financial Secretary's letter.

The records are herewith ~~submitted~~ returned.

Sd. T. Ramaiya,
For Muzrai Commissioner.

No.M.2684/30-31 MEMO Dated 18-1-34.

Copy with the connected records is forwarded to the Gubbi Sub Division Officer for resubmission with a report on the points mentioned above within 10 days.

Ramachandra Rao

For Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.
19-1-34

Camp 30/38/84

Forwarded to the Asstt Collr., Kurnool for report on the points raised in the second para of the Financial Secy's letter within five days. Mamdar please treat this very urgent

Mamdar please submit report in advance and return

26-1-1934

Asstt Collr
24/1/34

alore, 27 June 193

29 JUN. 1934
MUZRAI BRANCH

Mys 267 & 32-12

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
27 JUNE 1934
No.

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAU, ESQ., B A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

[illegible]

Sir,

[illegible]

Asst Comr

VB (absent from Station)

GOVERNMENT OF HIS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 647 Misc 267-32-17 Mysore, 2 Sept 10

Dated, Bangalore, 30th October 1934.

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja o Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysor ,

B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No.1612/33-34 dated 27th June 1934, regarding removal of the Brahmin Parpathegar of the Vedijur Temple in Mulgal Taluk, I am directed to state that the Dharmadarsis of the Temple have made representations to Government also, concerning this Parpathegar. In this connection there are two questions for consideration - one about Puja and the other relating to the management of the Temple. In the former case Government think, it is but right that the Lingayets should continue to conduct the Puja. As regards the other question the management of the temple is an administrative matter and if the present Parpathegar is unpopular as seemed from the local feeling, he may be replaced by a more desirable man but his successor need no perhaps necessarily be a Lingayet, in view of the fact that all the different communities of the Hindus are stated to be devotees of the temple. Government also think that if the Parpathegar is to be removed for unpopularity, some compensation has perhaps to be given to him.

I am to request you to be so good as to go into

into these matters and report the result of action for the information of Government, at an early date.

The enclosures to your letter are returned herewith.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for Chief Secretary to Government.

. .1.3/30.X.34.

FG—1]

ECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 30/10/34

Signed by PW 13 Mudaliar Krishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by

Examined by.....

Q. Circuit

Section Mesc

File No. 267-32

Serial No. 14

No. 647 Rec me, 2 petns + one file

To The Municipal Commr

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No 1612/30-31 dated 27th June 1934 regarding removal of the Brahmin parpathegars of the Yedinr Temple in Kunigal Tk I am directed to state that the Dharmakarsis of the Temple have made representation to this Govt concerning this parpathegars. In this connection there are two questions for consideration — & a search is to be made in the office to ascertain the

WD 01956—GPB—22,500—12-6-34

think, it is best right that the Singarajah
Land should continue to conduct the puja
As regards the other question the management
of the temple is an administrative matter.
and if the present parsathegar is unpopular
with ~~the~~ some of the local people, he may
be replaced by a more desirable man but
his successor need not necessarily
be a Singarajah, in view of the fact that all
the different communities of the Hindus
are stated to be debtors to the temple.
I do not also think that if the parsathegar
is to be removed for unpopularity, some
compensation has perhaps to be given to him
I have to request to you to be so good
as to go into these matters and submit
a report for the information
of Govt, at an early date.
The enclosures to your letter were returned herewith.

I have etc

29/10/34

for Chief Secy to Govt
DPC
29/10

1612
30-31 Rue Records

B aalore,.....20th..December.....195 4.

22

FRQ Mis 217-32-15 Dno 760

N. MADHAVA RAU, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Mus

To

Rajasevasakta
P. Ranga Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief *Secretary to the Government of His Highness*
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Finance
Department

22/12/34

SIR,

Removal of the Kalamma temple at Kunigal to Kunigal town.

In reference to your letter No. 647/ M.B.307-32-1, dated 3-12-1934 re: the above, I have the honour to forward herewith the copy of letter No. 3034/ M-1 dated 6-12-1934 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, with which he has forwarded the proposal of the Executive Committee of the Kunigal Municipality that the Kalamma temple in Kunigal may be removed from its present site to the new site at a cost of Rs.300/- for loss of income and that the Committee may be allowed to collect the loss thereon in the place of the present grant of Rs.10/- per mensem.

I request that the proposal of the Deputy Commissioner may be approved.

I have the honor

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Muzrai Commissioner.

istrict, to the [illegible]

[illegible]

ject.- [illegible]

[illegible]

th reference to your [illegible] dated 7-11-4, [illegible]

copy of the letter No. 11. dated 6-10- [illegible]

overment of Income in connection with the above subject, [illegible]

[illegible] officer's O.A.I.)(3)/63-63 dated 6-11-4 to recover a sum of [illegible]

[illegible] officer was granted a time [illegible]

of Rs.12/- or I [illegible] to make the efforts to [illegible]

[illegible] Rs.200/- [illegible]

the loss [illegible]

[illegible] officer [illegible] penalty sanctioned, [illegible]

[illegible] Rs.12/-.

[illegible]

[illegible]

p. VI—G 2]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Mog

File No. 267-32

Serial No. 16

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Date of issue.....6-2-..... 1935.

Signed by Mr B Muddu Krishnappa.

Read— Correspondence ending with letter No 1612/30-31 dated 22.12.1934 from the M.C in ellore. Stating that ~~in the circumstances reported~~ the D.C Tirupathi has proposed that the present Darshathegas ~~Order thereon.—No~~ of the Yedhiyur Temple in Kunigal Taluk may be resumed on payment to him of a compensation of Rs 200 for loss of appointment, that he should appoint a high class Hindu in his place on a pay of Rs 12/

May this be—

(i) printed ?

(ii) treated as a standing order ?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English part ?

(iv) translated ?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press ?

(vi) published in the Gazette, kannada part ?

D.C may be a
Order 1013 - Encl. thereto
The two proposals of
D.C. Timken as mentioned
above and agreed to by the
M.C are appended

31/1/35
Mr Chief Secretary
The M.C will receive
... consideration
- D.C Timken

List of Enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0254—GPB—10,000—22-8-32